

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

9

FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

10

11

PATRICK BLACKSHIRE,

12

Plaintiff,

13

14

v.

15

THE HAUGE, et al.,

16

Defendants.

Case No. 2:23-cv-0531-KJM-JDP (PS)

ORDER

17

18

19

On November 6, 2024, the magistrate judge filed findings and recommendations, which were served on plaintiff, and which contained notice that any objections to the findings and recommendations were to be filed within fourteen days. No objections were filed.¹

20

21

22

23

24

25

The court presumes that any findings of fact are correct. *See Orand v. United States*, 602 F.2d 207, 208 (9th Cir. 1979). The magistrate judge's conclusions of law are reviewed de novo. *See Robbins v. Carey*, 481 F.3d 1143, 1147 (9th Cir. 2007) ("[D]eterminations of law by the magistrate judge are reviewed de novo by both the district court and [the appellate] court . . ."). Having reviewed the file, the court finds the findings and recommendations to be supported by the record and by the proper analysis.

26

27

28

¹ Although it appears from the file that plaintiff's copy of the findings and recommendations was returned, plaintiff was properly served. It is the plaintiff's responsibility to keep the court apprised of his current address at all times. Pursuant to Local Rule 182(f), service of documents at the record address of the party is fully effective.

1 Accordingly, IT IS ORDERED that:

2 1. The findings and recommendations filed November 6, 2024, are adopted in full;

3 2. Plaintiff's second amended complaint, ECF No. 16, is dismissed without leave to

4 amend;

5 3. All pending motions, ECF Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, and 18, are denied as moot; and

6 4. The Clerk of Court is directed to close this case.

7 This resolves ECF Nos. 12, 13, 14, 15, 16 and 18.

8 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

9 DATED: January 23, 2025.

10
11 
12

13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE